

REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action of January 25, 2008, applicants ask that all claims be allowed in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks. Claims 1-33 are pending, with claims 1-3 and 8 being independent. Claims 1-3 and 8 have been amended and claims 30-33 have been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims may be found in the originally filed application at least at page 7, lines 12-23; FIG. 1; and FIG. 2. No new matter has been added.

This response is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-10, 12-14, 18, 26, 27, and 29

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-10, 12-14, 18, 26, 27, and 29 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0002703 (Koyama) in view U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0067424 (Akimoto). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Koyama, Akimoto, nor any proper combination of these references describes or suggests the subject matter of independent claims 1, 2, and 8.

Among other features, amended claims 1, 2, and 8 recite a light-emitting element, a first transistor for determining a value of a current flowing to the light-emitting element, and a second transistor for determining a light emission or non light emission of the light-emitting element depending on a video signal input to a signal line. The light-emitting element, the first transistor, and the second transistor are connected in series between a first power line and a second counter electrode of the light-emitting element. The signal line, the first power line, and the second power line are provided in parallel with each other, and the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line.

Neither Koyama, Akimoto, nor any proper combination of these references describes or suggests a signal line, a first power line, and a second power line in parallel with each other, where the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line.

Koyama relates to an electroluminescent display that includes a pixel portion 101 in which pixels 104 are arranged in matrix form. See Koyama at ¶ 0106 and Fig. 1. A gate electrode of a transistor 105 included in a pixel 104 is connected to a gate signal line 106, and

either the source or the drain of the transistor 105 is connected to a source signal line 107. See Koyama at ¶ 0116. A transistor 109 is connected to a power supply line (V_n) 110 and to a transistor 112. See Koyama at ¶ 0117 and Fig. 3. A gate electrode of the transistor 112 is connected to a power source control line 113. See Koyama at ¶ 0117 and Fig. 3.

The Office Action appears to equate the power line 110 with the recited first power line, the power source control line 113 with the recited second power line, and the source signal line 107 with the recited signal line. However, as seen in Figure 3 of Koyama, the power line 110, the power source control line 113, and the signal line 107 are not in parallel with each other, nor is the power line 110 between the power source control line 113 and the signal line 107. Accordingly, Koyama does not describe or suggest signal line, a first power line, and a second power line in parallel with each other, where the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line.

Akimoto does not remedy the failure of Koyama to describe or suggest this feature. Akimoto relates to an image display device. See Akimoto at ¶ 0001. In one aspect of Akimoto, a display panel includes pixels 10 arranged in matrix form, and each pixel is connected to drive circuits surrounding the display through a reset line 15, a signal line 17, and a light-on switch line 19. See Akimoto at ¶ 0042. In each pixel, the signal line 17 is connected through a pixel capacitor 2 to the gate of a transistor 4, and the source of the transistor 4 is connected to a power supply line 18. See Akimoto at ¶ 0043. However, the signal line 17, the power supply line 18, and the light-on switch 19 are not in parallel with each other, nor is Akimoto's power supply line 18 between signal line 17 and the light-on switch line 19. Thus, even if the signal line 17, the power supply line 18, and the light-on switch 19 could be respectively equated with the recited signal line, the recited first power line, and the recited second power line, Akimoto would not describe or suggest a signal line, a first power line, and a second power line in parallel with each other, where the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line, as recited in amended claims 1, 2, and 8.

For at least these reasons, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 2, and 8 and their dependent claims 9, 10, 12-14, 18, 26, and 27.

Claims 3, 15, 19, 25, and 28

Claims 3, 15, 19, 25, and 28 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Koyama in view of Akimoto and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0113760 (Kimura). Among other features, amended claim 3 recites a signal line, a first power line, and a second power line in parallel with each other, where the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line. As discussed above, neither Koyama nor Akimoto describe or suggest this feature. Kimura, which is cited as showing a fourth transistor for forcing a light emitting element into a non-emission state, does not remedy the failure of Koyama and Akimoto to describe or suggest the noted feature of claim 3. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 and its dependent claims 15, 19, 25, and 28.

Claim 17

Claim 17, which depends from claim 3, has been rejected as being unpatentable over Koyama in view of Akimoto, Kimura, and U.S. Patent No. 6,207,969 (Yamazaki). Yamazaki, which is cited as showing a light-emitting device including a depletion type transistor, does not remedy the failure of Koyama, Akimoto, and Kimura to describe or suggest the noted feature of claim 3. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17.

Claims 5-7, 11, 16, and 20-24

Claims 5-7, 11, 16, and 20-24, which depend, directly or indirectly from one of claims 1, 2, and 8 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Koyama in view of Akimoto and Yamazaki. As discussed above with respect to claim 17, Yamazaki does not remedy the failure of Koyama and Akimoto to describe or suggest a signal line, a first power line, and a second power line in parallel with each other, where the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line, as recited in amended claims 1, 2, and 8. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-7, 11, 16, and 20-24.

Claim Rejections—Nonstatutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Osame '586 in view of Akimoto

Claims 1-29 have been rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,173,586 (Osame '586) in view of Akimoto. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because claims 1-10 of Osame '586 do not recite a signal line, a first power line, and a second power line in parallel with each other, where the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line, as recited in amended claims 1-3 and 8, and because, as discussed above Akimoto also fails to do so.

Osame '934 in view of Akimoto

Claims 1-29 have been rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-40 of U.S. Patent No. 7,141,934 (Osame '934) in view of Akimoto. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because claims 1-40 of Osame '934 do not recite a signal line, a first power line, and a second power line in parallel with each other, where the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line, as recited in amended claims 1-3 and 8, and because, as discussed above Akimoto also fails to do so.

Fukumoto in view of Akimoto

Claims 1-29 have been rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-40 of U.S. Patent No. 7,122,969 (Fukumoto) in view of Akimoto. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because claims 1-40 of Fukumoto do not recite a signal line, a first power line, and a second power line in parallel with each other, where the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line, as recited in amended claims 1-3 and 8, and because, as discussed above Akimoto also fails to do so.

Yamazaki ('942) in view of Akimoto

Claims 1-29 have been rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-52 of U.S. Patent No. 7,358,942 (Yamazaki '942)¹ in view of Akimoto. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because claims 1-52 of Yamazaki '942 do not recite a signal line, a first power line, and a second power line in parallel with each other, where the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line, as recited in amended claims 1-3 and 8, and because, as discussed above Akimoto also fails to do so.

Yamazaki ('565) in view of Akimoto

Claims 1-29 have been provisionally rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0252565 (Yamazaki '565) in view of Akimoto. Without conceding obviousness, applicants request that this provisional rejection be held in abeyance until the claims of both the present application and those in Yamazaki '565 are otherwise held to be allowable. Moreover, claims 1-22 of Yamazaki '565 do not recite a signal line, a first power line, and a second power line in parallel with each other, where the first power line is provided between the signal line and the second power line, as recited in amended claims 1-3 and 8.

New Claims

New claims 30-33 depend from one of independent claims 1-3 and 8 and are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1-3 and 8.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be

¹ Applicants note that the Office Action made this rejection based on U.S. Application Serial No. 10/840,611, which is now U.S. Patent No. 7,358,942.

exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Fees in the amount of \$1010 in payment for the Request for Continued Examination fee (\$810) and the excess claim fees (\$200) are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. No additional fee is believed due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 25, 2008

Meghan A. McGovern
Meghan A. McGovern
Reg. No. 60,476

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331